

**Notes from  
Dark Energy Survey (DES) DECam Project  
Working Group Meeting (WGM)  
Friday, May 18, 2007  
10:00 – 12:00 Noon in the Snake Pit**

*Attending: Ed Temple, John Peoples, Wyatt Merritt, Hugh Montgomery, Huan Lin, Herman Cease, Andy Stefanik, Juan Estrada, Tom Diehl, Jeff Appel, Jim Annis, Douglas Tucker, Greg Bock, Brenna Flaugher, Cristina Beldica (by phone), Chris Smith (by phone), Alistair Walker (by phone), Tim Abbott (by phone)*

The agenda of today's meeting was the discussion of the recommendations from the joint DOE-NSF review in the review committee's draft report. John and Brenna both gave presentations, which can be found on the OPMO website for this meeting at: [http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projects/DES/WGM/2007/05\\_18/base.htm](http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projects/DES/WGM/2007/05_18/base.htm).

**1. John's presentation**

John discussed the recommendations from the Science Section and from the Data Management and Simulation Section of the review committee report. He also commented on the recommendations on DES Project Management. John's slides cover the discussion thoroughly, and are available here: [http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projects/DES/WGM/2007/05\\_18/DESDirector's18May07presentation\(v1\).pdf](http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projects/DES/WGM/2007/05_18/DESDirector's18May07presentation(v1).pdf).

During the discussion, John noted the need to create a DES Project Office.

While discussing the recommendation in the Data Management and Simulations section of the draft report to "[s]trengthen the astronomy/image processing group responsible for the core data reduction," Cristina noted that, with funding, this would be possible. She also noted that there are plans at NCSA/UIUC for a new hire to replace Wayne Barkhouse, who is departing UIUC to take up a faculty position at the University of North Dakota. It was noted that an astronomer who can write software would be preferable to a computing professional for new hires.

It was also noted that Joe has sent a draft plan for gathering the science data and software requirements to the DES Management Council. There are concerns about getting the process right, including a sensible hierarchy of separate requirements and specifications documents in the custody of the correct groups in the organization chart. Joe, Josh, and John are in the process of discussing these plans.

It was noted that LSST is devoting about one-third of \$240 million to software and data management.

**ACTION ITEM – Add Steve Kent's SDSS software requirements document to the DES docdb.**

It was also noted that NSF and DOE have “formed a Joint Oversight Group (JOG) to act as the official contact point between the agencies and the DES Project Director, Dr. John Peoples.” The JOG is currently Kathy Turner and Nigel Sharp. The letter informing John of the formation of the JOG is included as an addendum to his slides.

## 2. Brenna’s presentation

Brenna discussed the technical recommendations; the cost, schedule, and funding recommendations; and the project management recommendations from the draft report. She also discussed news and listed upcoming DECam workshops. As with John’s presentation, Brenna’s slides cover the discussion thoroughly, and are available here: [http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projects/DES/WGM/2007/05\\_18/pmg-may1807.pdf](http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projects/DES/WGM/2007/05_18/pmg-may1807.pdf).

Some highlights from this discussion include:

- There were several items by Roger Smith regarding the cooling system. This may be due to the fact that, in a previous review, Roger had made many comments (but no recommendations) for the cooling system, and, in the response to that review, we only responded to review recommendations (and not the comments). Roger may have felt that we had ignored his previous comments. This was a mistake on our part that we should not repeat. We have made studies of the cooling alternatives, which will be documented for the next review in a technical note.
- The reviewers gave good advice on splitting CD-3 into CD-3a and CD-3b. The current idea is to have the next directors’ review in November and the next CD review in December. We probably want to go with a joint CD-2/3a review. Mont suggested that, when we request CD-3a, we will need to provide motivation for CD-3a (e.g., because of long lead times and critical path items in FY08).
- The main MOU (among FNAL, NOAO, and NCSA) awaits NSF’s agreement on a set of deliverables; getting to an agreement would seem to be the responsibility of the JOG.
- Smaller MOUs would cover construction parts of the project but not operations.
- Statements of Work (SOWs) would be updated annually.
- The recommendation to separate the scientific requirements and the technical specifications before July 1 seems too fast. John suggests 4-5 documents, including ones for science requirements, DECam requirements, DM requirements, and CFIP requirements.
- Darren DePoy of OSU is considering taking on the role of DECam Project Scientist.
- There will be several DECam-related workshops in the coming months, including:
  - Image Quality Workshop (May 22)
  - SISPI Workshop (June)
  - Cooling Workshop (July/August)
  - Front-end Electronics Workshop (c. September)
- With reference to the Cooling Workshop, Mont requested explicitly including a vulnerability analysis and risk assessment for failure modes. (Mont noted that ATLAS recently encountered a problem in which their heaters did not work but were inaccessible during normal operations.)

**3. Next meeting:**

The next meeting is provisionally scheduled for June 15 or June 22. The key topic will be planning for what needs to be done for a CD-2/3a series of reviews for DECam.

Note added during editing: the next meeting date is now confirmed and will be June 22.